

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7-9 stand rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clydesdale (U.S. 1,269,388). Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 5, which are not rejected over Clydesdale. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-6 stand rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Block (U.S. 1,733,681) and further in view of Serban (RO 1,158,859) and Clydesdale. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest that the member attached to an inner surface of a tread is a sound absorbing member formed of a porous material, as described in claim 1.

Clydesdale discloses an armor consisting of a plurality of articulated thin metal plates 10 and 11, as described in lines 37-39. The plates 10 and 11 form a continuous chain structure (lines 40-62). The metal plates of Clydesdale does not disclose or suggest the sound absorbing member formed of a porous material as described in claim 1. Moreover, the armor of Clydesdale is disposed between the tire and a pneumatic tube. In contrast, the sound absorbing member is attached to the inner surface of the tire in the present invention.

Block and Serban also do not disclose or suggest the claimed member attached to the inner surface of the tread by an elastic fixing band of metal and being a sound absorbing member formed of a porous material. The strap 10 of Block is used to lace the sheet metal members 3 and 7 to each other. The metal sheets 3 and 7 protect the inner tube from punctures and the tire casing from blowouts. They are not sound absorbing members

formed of a porous material, as described in the claims. For these reasons, claim 1 and its respective dependent claims are believed to be allowable over the cited references. withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Block, Serban and Clydesdale. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, from which claim 2 depends, and because of the additional features recited in claim 2. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, and because of the additional features recited in these claims.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

March 17, 2008

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\4386\77713\CO9680.DOC